

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/719,910	CUMBERS, BLAKE
	Examiner M. A. Sager	Art Unit 3714

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) M. A. Sager. (3) _____.

(2) Robb Phillips (40305). (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 21 June 2007.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 29-34.

Identification of prior art discussed: Matchett, Franchi, Gormley.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.



Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Exr contacted counsel to indicate that claims 29-34 were not patentable for similar reasons to claims of same/similar scope co-pending apps 10357832/10757652 of similar scope over art of record herein or in cited apps Exr suggested cancellation of claims 29-34 in exr's amdt as an expedient for allowance that would not preclude applicants rights to re-file the claims in another app or pending application. Counsel agreed to cancellation in exr's amdt without agreeing to merits of patentability of those claims .